

United States District Court

WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

STEVEN ARTHUR MARKLEY

ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING REVOCATION HEARING

Case Number: **1:09-CR-318**

In accordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. §3142(f), a detention hearing has been held. I conclude that the following facts require the detention of the defendant pending revocation hearing in this case.

Part I - Findings of Fact

- ☐ (1) The defendant is charged with an offense described in 18 U.S.C. §3142(f)(1) and has been convicted of a (federal offense) (state or local offense that would have been a federal offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had existed) that is
- ☐ a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C. §3156(a)(4).
- ☐ an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death.
- ☐ an offense for which the maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in _____
- ☐ a felony that was committed after the defendant had been convicted of two or more prior federal offenses described in 18 U.S.C. §3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable state or local offenses.
- ☐ (2) The offense described in finding (1) was committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state or local offense.
- ☐ (3) A period of not more than five years has elapsed since the (date of conviction) (release of the defendant from imprisonment) for the offense described in finding (1).
- ☐ (4) Findings Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of (an) other person(s) and the community. I further find that the defendant has not rebutted this presumption.

Alternate Findings (A)

- ☐ (1) There is probable cause to believe that the defendant has committed an offense
- ☐ for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in _____
- ☐ under 18 U.S.C. §924(c).
- ☐ (2) The defendant has not rebutted the presumption established by finding 1 that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community.

Alternate Findings (B)

- ☒ (1) There is a serious risk that the defendant will not appear.
- ☒ (2) There is a serious risk that the defendant will endanger the safety of another person or the community.

Defendant assaulted his girlfriend and police officers on July 20, 2013, and another police officer at the Van Buren County Jail on July 26, 2013. He eventually pled guilty and was given credit for time served (275 days), much of which was consumed for the purpose of giving defendant a mental evaluation. Defendant attributes his conduct to being on a variety of prescription medications, including oxycotin and Xanax, for PTSD. However, defendant has had a previous history of threatening behavior, (continued on attachment)

Part II - Written Statement of Reasons for Detention

Defendant has failed to meet his burden that he will not be a danger to the community, by clear and convincing evidence.

Part III - Directions Regarding Detention

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or his designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility. The defendant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility shall deliver the defendant to the United States marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

Dated: April 28, 2014

/s/ Hugh W. Brenneman, Jr.

Signature of Judicial Officer

Hugh W. Brenneman, Jr., United States Magistrate Judge

Name and Title of Judicial Officer

UNITED STATES v. STEVEN ARTHUR MARKLEY

1:09-CR-318

ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING REVOCATION HEARING

Page 2.

Alternate Findings (B) - (continued)

and the most recent behavior may simply be an escalation of that. The difficulty is in predicting future conduct.

In the absence of any evidence as to the effect of the medication, and without having a copy of the mental evaluation performed, the court can only speculate as to defendant's present propensity for further assaultive behavior.